Findings Concerning Mitigation of Significant Environmental Effects
San Luis Rey River Park Master Plan
San Diego, California

State Clearinghouse Number 2006051074

September 24, 2008

The Board of Supervisors for the County of San Diego has reviewed and considered the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the San Luis Rey River Park Master Plan. As a result of this review and in consideration of and pursuant to §21081 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the following findings, supported by substantial evidence, are made for each significant effect identified in the Final PEIR for the San Luis Rey River Park Master Plan.

1. Agriculture

Significant Effect: Impact AG-1: Development of Tier A sites on lands identified as Important Farmland in the PEIR would preclude agricultural activities from occurring and/or render the lands unusable for agricultural purposes resulting in a significant direct long-term impact. Specific impacts cannot be analyzed at this time because Tier A site locations are unknown and that analysis would be speculative. Important Farmland is defined in the PEIR as lands (1) designated by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance; (2) containing soils mapped by the Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) database as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance; (3) under Williamson Act contracts; (4) zoned as A70 or A72; or (5) that have been used for irrigated agriculture within 4 years of the time development occurs. Within the proposed Park boundaries, 170.3 acres are defined as Important Farmland by the FMMP; 121.6 acres are defined as Important Farmland by both the FMMP and SSURGO; none are under Williamson Act contract; 845.4 acres are zoned A70; and 342.4 acres are zoned A72. While the location of Tier A sites is not known, the criteria developed in the Master Plan for the siting of Tier A sites for active recreational uses require development in areas primarily characterized by nonnative or disturbed vegetation, including eucalyptus woodland, nonnative grasslands, and agricultural sites. Active recreation would preclude the use of Tier A sites for commercially viable agriculture and/or render the land unsuitable for agriculture. Since Important Farmland is a finite resource, lost acreage cannot be replaced, and the loss would be permanent. (FEIR 2.1-4)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(3), specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives

identified in the PEIR. Thus, the impact is considered to be significant and not mitigated. (FEIR Page 2.1-6) This unavoidable impact is overridden by project benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Mitigation Measures:

M-AG-1: Development of Tier A uses will avoid conversion of Important Farmland if feasible, but the potential for significant unmitigated impacts remain.

Rationale: Effective mitigation for the impact of developing Park Tier A uses in areas identified as Important Farmland in the PEIR is avoidance of the Important Farmland. However, the impact would continue to be significant in areas where avoidance of Important Farmland is not considered feasible considering the objectives of Park development and the availability of land suitable for active uses. A core objective of Park development is: "To provide active recreational opportunities for nearby communities." Active recreational uses, as explained in the PEIR, are needed in the area of the San Luis Rey River valley, which suffers from a deficit of developed park space. The basic objective of providing active recreational uses may not be met or may be greatly diminished if Important Farmlands are totally avoided.

The Master Plan proposes to develop Tier A uses with minimal disruption of natural habitat, with as little grading as possible, and only by purchase from willing sellers. Therefore, the Master Plan's siting criteria for Tier A sites is guided toward vacant sites that are relatively level, lacking extensive natural cover and habitat, and owned by willing sellers. Such areas in the San Luis Rey River valley usually have been used at some time for agriculture; the same features that make them suitable for active Park uses under the parameters stated in the Master Plan also make them suitable for agriculture. Consequently, total avoidance of agricultural resources would likely diminish the Park acreage goal to be devoted to active recreation and would likely eliminate active use sites near communities on the eastern end of the proposed Park.

Moreover, relocation of Tier A facilities to other undisturbed areas within the Park boundaries in order to avoid Important Farmland would also be inconsistent with the Park's other goals to preserve biological, ecological and cultural resources, because these undisturbed areas contain sensitive resources which the Park proposes to preserve. Because of the objectives of Park development and the importance of providing active recreational opportunities to residents of the county and communities near the Park the complete avoidance of Important Farmland in developing Tier A uses is not considered feasible.

A possible way to partially compensate for the loss of land that could be impacted by development of Tier A sites would be for the County to preserve Important Farmland elsewhere, either through outright purchase, purchase of a restrictive easement, or through some other instrument, such as a Williamson Act contract. However, this measure might not ensure that such land would be

farmed, since it would depend on the willingness of another party to conduct agricultural operations on the site or sites. Furthermore, since the amount of Important Farmland is finite, it would not eliminate the loss of Important Farmland due to project development. In addition, funds for Park site acquisition are limited, and use of County Parks and Recreation Department funds to preserve agricultural land would reduce the funding available for Park development. Therefore, this means of mitigating for possible impacts to Important Farmland is not considered feasible. (FEIR Page 2.1-6)

Significant Effect: Impact AG-2: Development of the Park could convert Important Farmland to Park uses and contribute to a cumulative conversion of Important Farmland to other uses, resulting in a significant long-term cumulative impact. The loss of valuable and productive farmland is a condition that affects all of San Diego County and has been identified in the PEIR as a direct significant effect of the proposed Park and of other cumulative projects considered in the PEIR. Since a direct significant impact was identified in the PEIR, development of the proposed Park would significantly contribute to the cumulative loss of Important Farmland in the county (FEIR Page 2.1-5)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(3), specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the PEIR. Thus, the impact is considered to be significant and not mitigated. (FEIR Pages 2.1-6 – 2.1-7) This unavoidable impact is overridden by project benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Mitigation Measures:

M-AG-2: See mitigation measure M-AG-1.

Rationale: To avoid a contribution to the cumulative loss of Important Farmland, development of the Park would have to avoid the conversion of Important Farmland to the active uses proposed for Tier A sites. Such avoidance is, for reasons more fully explained above, infeasible because avoidance of Important Farmland would likely preclude or diminish development of active recreational uses in the San Luis Rey River valley, thereby failing to accomplish the project's most basic objectives. Other possible ways to partially mitigate for the loss of Important Farmland through preservation elsewhere, either through outright purchase, purchase of a restrictive easement, or through some other instrument, such as a Williamson Act contract, are also infeasible as explained above. (FEIR Pages 2.1-6 – 2.1-7)

Project Alternatives and Agricultural Resources Impacts:

Biological Resources Alternative
Since the location and size of Tier A sites are not known at this stage of planning impacts on agricultural resources are uncertain. Although dependent on design,

the Biological Resource Emphasis Alternative would probably affect Important Farmland in a way similar to the proposed project and result in a significant impact that could not be effectively mitigated because the alternative would still locate Tier A sites in areas that are disturbed, being used for agriculture, or suitable for agricultural use. Therefore, the alternative is not likely to avoid or substantially lessen impacts to agricultural resources.

In addition, this alternative would place the Park's emphasis on preservation of resources as opposed to recreational uses. Currently there is a general deficit of public active recreation fields in the North County region. The existing fields in the area are over-used and degraded forcing leagues to eliminate their programs or travel significant distance to play their games due to lack of available home fields. Using the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) standard for playing fields, the Master Plan process determined that for the communities in the Park service area, especially Bonsall, Fallbrook, and the area near I-15, approximately eight additional fields for soccer and football (these sports can be played on the same field) were needed. The recreational needs of the communities would not be addressed under this alternative due to the limited number of recreational facilities proposed.

The alternative would also focus recreational programming and activity on upland sites to separate recreation from preservation, creating a series of loosely connected upland recreation sites that would not be accessible from the trail system. This alternative would compromise the goal of the proposed trail network to provide continuous year-round access to the Parks' amenities and provide circulation throughout the Park. In addition, no trail bridges would be constructed to provide continuity of the system throughout the Park. Trails would also be placed along existing slopes and in areas of non-native vegetation with focus outside the river corridor. Placing trails parallel to the roadway would diminish the trail experience which is an integral component of the proposed Park. Therefore, this alternative, even though it is the environmentally superior alternative, is rejected because it is infeasible.

River Park Emphasis Alternative
Since the location and size of Tier A sites are not known at this stage of planning, impacts on agricultural resources are uncertain. Although dependent on design, the River Park Emphasis Alternative would probably affect Important Farmland in a way similar to the proposed project and result in a significant impact that could not be effectively mitigated because the alternative would still locate Tier A sites in areas that are disturbed, being used for agriculture, or suitable for agricultural use. Therefore, this alternative is not likely to avoid or substantially lessen impacts to agricultural resources.

In addition, this alternative was developed to maximize the ability of the proposed Park to serve the needs of communities along the river valley for active recreational park development. This alternative would only propose minor habitat

preservation within the proposed Park area and would group recreation and preservation together. Under this alternative the Park would not be able to fully achieve its core goal to enhance the open space value of the valley and protect the biological and ecological resources because the preserve area would be made up of smaller isolated patches of lower quality habitat within the Park area. Therefore, this alternative is rejected because it is infeasible.

Existing Community Plan Alternative
The Existing Community Plan Alternative could result in a slightly less impact to agricultural lands than the proposed project, but it is not likely that the alternative would completely avoid or substantially lessen impacts to Important Farmland, because existing zoning still allows uses such as residential, equestrian facilities and golf courses, and these uses would also preclude agricultural uses at the site. Therefore, this alternative is not likely to avoid or substantially lessen impacts to agricultural resources.

In addition, under this alternative, individual property owners (public and private) could seek to develop their properties consistent with the current zoning regulations. Therefore property owners that may otherwise be willing sellers to the County pursuant to the project may move forward with development of their lands exclusive of recreational facilities under this alternative. As explained above, currently there is a general deficit of public active recreation fields in the North County region. The recreational needs of the communities would not be addressed under this alternative.

Furthermore, the development allowed under the existing zoning regulations could potentially impact sensitive biological communities and sensitive cultural resources that would otherwise be preserved by the proposed Park. Only limited preservation may occur to mitigate for the specific development project in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. Therefore, under this alternative the project would not be able to achieve its core goals to enhance the open space value of the valley, protect the biological and ecological resources, meet the recreational needs of surrounding communities and preserve the valley's cultural and historical heritage. Therefore, this alternative is rejected because it is infeasible.

No Project Alternative
The No Project Alternative would avoid the proposed Park's impacts to Important Farmland. However, there would be no development of recreation or preservation areas under this alternative. Therefore, this alternative would not accomplish any of the project's goals, nor result in any of the benefits of Park development, including providing recreational opportunities, preserving open space, and protecting biological and ecological resources. Therefore, this alternative is rejected because it is infeasible.

In conclusion, specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the project alternatives identified in the PEIR (FEIR Page 1-1 – 1-4 and 4-2 – 4-3 and 4-6 – 4-7 and 4-10 – 4-11)

2. Mineral Resources

Significant Effect: Impact GE-3: Development of the Preserve could include land that contains valuable sand and aggregate resources and preclude the future mining of the sand and gravel resources, resulting in a significant direct long-term impact. Much of the proposed San Luis Rey River Park is classified as "Mineral Resource Zone 2," or MRZ-2. This classification is given to areas known to have significant mineral deposits, as well as to areas where the presence of such deposits can be inferred using adequate data. The alluvial sand and gravel deposits within the San Luis Rey River area are responsible for its designation as an MRZ-2 site. Such deposits are valued construction resources for the region. Alluvial mineral resources in the San Luis Rey River area also have increased value due to their frequent replenishment by the natural processes of the river. The Park Master Plan proposes the creation of a 1,600-acre Preserve focused on the San Luis Rey River. Any possible future operation of inactive mines or the development of new mines would not be compatible with the objectives of the Park and the Preserve. Any future operation of mines within or adjacent to the Preserve could have direct and indirect impacts on the biological functioning of the Preserve by generating noise, human activity, operation of heavy equipment, access for trucks, and other factors that could affect biological resources within the Preserve. The loss of potential sand and aggregate mine sites due to the creation of a Preserve by the project could significantly affect the regionally important mineral resources known to be present in the river valley. (FEIR Page 2.2-8)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(3), specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the PEIR. Thus, the impact is considered to be significant and not mitigated. (FEIR Pages 2.2-10 – 2.2-11) This unavoidable impact is overridden by project benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Mitigation Measures:

M-GE-3: The goal of the project is to create an open space park system that aims to balance recreation and preservation of the San Luis Rey River sensitive resources. Mining and resource extraction are not reconcilable activities with the project's recreation and preservation objectives. Mining and resource extraction in areas planned for preservation are not appropriate, as they would result in impacts to the habitat value of adjacent areas (resulting from increased noise etc.). Mitigation strategies that would allow limited extraction of mineral resources, while technically possible, would not meet the preservation-related goals of the project Master Plan.

Rationale: To mitigate this impact, the project would have to completely avoid MRZ-2 lands or allow limited extraction of mineral resources within the proposed project area. However, neither mitigation option is feasible as development of the Preserve would likely be precluded and the project would be inhibited from implementing its recreational and preservation-related goals and objectives. Objectives of the development of the Park include "To enhance the open space value of the San Luis Rey River valley," "To enhance and preserve the San Luis Rey River valley's biological and ecological resources," and "To provide active recreational opportunities for nearby communities." The operation of mines within areas of the Park would result in noise, dust, human activity, and other effects that would adversely impact biological resources and which are incompatible with active recreation. Therefore, possible future operation of mines in or adjacent to the Preserve is not compatible with the core objectives of the project. In addition, to avoid or set aside all land designated MRZ-2 within the proposed Park boundaries would also preclude development of the Preserve because much of the proposed Park area is classified as MRZ-2 lands due to the alluvial sand and gravel deposits within the San Luis Rey River area; little or no land would be left for the Preserve if the Park avoided or set aside land designated MRZ-2. Therefore, neither mitigation option is considered feasible. (FEIR Pages 2.2-10 – 2.2-11)

Significant Effect: IMPACT GE-4: By acquiring land containing mineral resources for inclusion in the Preserve, the proposed Park could, in combination with the loss of such sites from changes in land use in the San Luis Rey River valley, contribute to a significant cumulative impact. The loss of valuable mineral resources is a condition that affects all of San Diego County and has been identified in the PEIR as a direct significant effect of the proposed Park and of other cumulative projects considered in the PEIR. The loss of potential sand and mineral resources due to the development of the Park could significantly affect the available mineral resources known to be present in the river valley. In San Diego County generally, productive mines are becoming a scarce resource, while development, which creates the demand for sand and mineral resources, continues. When combined with the potential loss of sand and mineral resources from other projects in the cumulative study area, the project would contribute to the cumulative loss of mineral resources in the County.(FEIR Pages 2.2-8 – 2.2-9)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(3), specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the PEIR. Thus, the impact is considered to be significant and not mitigated. (FEIR Pages 2.2-10 – 2.2-11) This unavoidable impact is overridden by project benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations.

Mitigation Measures:

M-GE-4: The contribution of the proposed project to the loss of sand and aggregate sources in the San Luis Rey River valley is subject to the same limits on mitigation as the direct impact on the loss of mineral resources discussed in mitigation measure MGE-3.

Rationale: To avoid a contribution to the cumulative loss of mineral resources, all or a significant portion of the land containing exploitable mineral resources would not be acquired for Park use. For reasons under the discussion of significant direct impacts on mineral resources, that mitigation measure is considered infeasible because avoidance of land containing exploitable mineral resources would likely preclude or diminish development of a functioning Preserve in the San Luis Rey River valley, contrary to the Park's objectives. Mitigation strategies that would allow limited extraction of mineral resources, while they may be technically possible, are also considered infeasible because, as further discussed above, the result would compromise the recreational and preservation-related goals of the proposed Master Plan. (FEIR Pages 2.2-10 – 2.2-11)

Project Alternatives and Mineral Resources Impacts:

Biological Resources Alternative
The Biological Resource Emphasis Alternative would share with the proposed project the preservation of lands centered on the San Luis Rey River as a biological and ecological Preserve. The mineral resources valuable as construction aggregate are the alluvial deposits along the river that would be included in the Preserve. Therefore the Biological Resource Emphasis Alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects of the proposed project on mineral resources.

In addition, this alternative would place the emphasis on preservation of resources as opposed to recreational uses. As discussed above, there is currently a general deficit of public active recreation fields in the North County region. The recreational needs of the communities would not be addressed under this alternative due to the limited number of facilities proposed.

The alternative would also focus recreational programming and activity on upland sites to separate recreation from preservation, creating a series of loosely connected upland recreation sites that would not be accessible from the trail system and would compromise the goal of the proposed trail network In addition, no trail bridges would be constructed to provide continuity of the system throughout the Park. Furthermore, under this alternative the trails would be placed along existing slopes and in areas of non-native vegetation with focus outside the river corridor. Placing trails parallel to the roadway would diminish the trail experience which is an integral component of the proposed Park. Therefore, this alternative, even though it is the environmentally superior alternative, is rejected because it is infeasible.

River Park Emphasis Alternative
The River Park Emphasis Alternative would share with the proposed project the preservation of lands centered on the San Luis Rey River as a biological and ecological Preserve. The mineral resources valuable as construction aggregate are the alluvial deposits along the river that would be included in the Preserve. Therefore River Park Emphasis Alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects of the proposed project on mineral resources.

In addition, this alternative was developed to maximize the ability of the proposed Park to serve the needs of communities along the river valley for active recreational park development. This alternative would only propose minor habitat preservation within the proposed Park area and would group recreation and preservation together. Under this alternative the project would not be able to fully achieve its goal to enhance the open space value of the valley, protect the biological and ecological resources and preserve the valley's cultural and historical heritage. Therefore, this alternative is rejected because it is infeasible.

Existing Community Plan Alternative
Under this alternative individual property owners (public and private) could seek to develop their properties consistent with the current zoning regulations, which allows uses such as residential, equestrian facilities, golf courses, and agriculture. Therefore there is no assurance that development by individual property owners consistent with the current zoning regulations would avoid the impact of the proposed project on mineral resources. Consequently, this alternative would not likely avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects of the proposed project on mineral resources.

In addition, as discussed above, there is a current general deficit of public active recreation fields in the North County region. However, property owners that may otherwise be willing sellers to the County pursuant to the project may under this alternative move forward with development of their lands exclusive of recreational facilities. Therefore, the public's recreational needs would not likely be addressed under this alternative.

Furthermore, the development allowed under the existing zoning regulations could potentially impact sensitive biological communities and sensitive cultural resources that would otherwise be preserved by the proposed Park. Under this alternative, only limited preservation may occur to mitigate for the specific development project in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. Therefore, under this alternative, the project would not be able to achieve its core goals to enhance the open space value of the valley and protect biological and ecological resources. Consequently, this alternative is rejected because it is infeasible.

No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative would not affect mineral resources in the San Luis Rey River valley. However, under this alternative there would be no development of recreation or preservation areas. Therefore this alternative would not result in any of the benefits of Park development to residents of nearby communities and the county, including providing recreational opportunities, preserving open space, and protecting biological and ecological resources. Therefore, this alternative is rejected because it is infeasible.

In conclusion, specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the project alternatives identified in the PEIR. (FEIR Page 1-1 – 1-4 and 4-2 – 4-3 and 4-6 – 4-7 and 4-10 – 4-11)

3. Biological Resources

Significant Effect: Impact BI-1: Construction of Tier A sites, Tier B sites, trails, and bridges has the potential to disturb or destroy any special status plant species that may be present at the time of construction resulting in a significant direct long-term impact. Special status plant species include those listed as threatened or endangered, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG); and those considered sensitive by the CDFG and California Native Plant Society (CNPS). Based on a California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) search of the Pala, Bonsall, and Boucher Hill U.S. Geological Survey quadrangles, a total of 18 sensitive plant species are known to occur in the general vicinity of the proposed Park. Only one sensitive plant species, the federally listed as endangered San Diego ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila*), has been recorded within and immediately adjacent to the proposed Park (FEIR Page 2.3-6)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-BI-1a. Prior to Director of Parks and Recreation approval of construction plans for Park facilities, a Biological Resources Report meeting County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Guidelines for Biological Resources standards shall be prepared to evaluate the specific locations of Tier A facilities, Tier B facilities, trails, and restoration areas; identify potential significant impacts; and require appropriate mitigation that shall be incorporated and implemented into the project before the approval of the construction plans.

M-BI-1b. A qualified biological resources monitor approved by the Director of Parks and Recreation or qualified park personnel shall be on site during

construction activities within 100 feet of sensitive biological resources to ensure protection measures (i.e., flagging, fencing etc. as noted in the mitigation measures below) are in place.

M-BI-1c. Tier A sites, Tier B sites, new trail routes, and trail bridges shall be designed to avoid special status plant species and their known habitat to the extent practicable based on historical information and biological resource surveys conducted within 1 year of the start of construction. At least two surveys shall be conducted for each site, one during the spring and one during the summer. Design of Tier A sites, including construction, shall avoid any habitat with the potential to support special status plants to the extent practicable. If impacts are unavoidable for any reason, mitigation for specific species shall be implemented as listed in Table 1.

M-BI-1d. All areas to be avoided that contain sensitive biological resources, including appropriate buffers, shall be flagged by a qualified biologist prior to the onset of construction activities. Where indicated by the biologist, these areas shall be fenced or otherwise protected from direct or indirect impacts. All such areas to be avoided shall be clearly marked on construction plans and designated as “no construction” zones.

M-BI-1e. Construction contractors or personnel shall implement a construction education program approved by the Director of Parks and Recreation to ensure that contractors and all construction personnel are informed of the biological constraints associated with any particular construction site. The education program shall focus on (a) the purpose for resource protection, (b) contractor identification of sensitive resource areas in the field such as areas delineated on maps and by flags or fencing, (c) protocol to resolve conflicts that may arise at any time during the construction process, and (d) ramifications of noncompliance. This program shall be conducted by a qualified biologist approved by the Direction of Parks and Recreation.

M-BI-1f. Construction activities within 200 feet of sensitive habitats (including habitats supporting special status plant or wildlife species), drainages, or other wetland or nonwetland waters shall be avoided and/or minimized, including restriction of equipment access and disposal or temporary placement of excess fill. Staging areas shall be located in disturbed habitat, to the degree feasible. Staging areas will be delineated on the grading plans. If staging areas outside the construction footprint are used, they will be surveyed for biological resources prior to use and shall not be used if sensitive biological resources would be directly or indirectly affected.

M-BI-1g. Construction vehicles shall use existing access roads to the degree feasible. Where new access is required, all vehicles shall attempt to use the same route, even if this requires heavy equipment to back out of such areas. All access routes outside of existing roads or the construction corridor shall be

clearly marked by flagging or staking by a biologist prior to the onset of construction. All access roads outside of existing roads or the construction corridor shall be delineated on the grading plans and reviewed by a qualified biologist.

M-BI-1h. Topsoil shall be stockpiled in disturbed areas currently lacking native vegetation. Stockpile areas will be delineated on the grading plans by a qualified biologist.

M-BI-1i. Fueling of equipment shall take place within existing paved roads, and not within or adjacent to drainages or native habitats (including habitats supporting special status plant or wildlife species). Contractor equipment will be checked for leaks prior to operation and repaired as necessary. "No-fueling zones" will be designated on construction maps. No fueling will be allowed within 200 feet of sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters.

Table 1
Mitigation Requirements for Special Status Plant Species

Common Name ***Scientific Name***	**Mitigation Requirements***
San Diego ambrosia *Ambrosia pumila*	• Mitigation will require in-kind preservation of individual plants at a 3:1 ratio. • Encroachment shall not exceed 20% of the population on-site. • Other areas of the Park should be surveyed to identify populations within the Park for in-kind preservation. • Manage invasive plant species within proposed preservation areas. • Install split-rail fencing to restrict illegal encroachment into the preserved San Diego ambrosia population. • Install signage along the fencing. • Install permanent markers to document the boundary of the preserved San Diego ambrosia population.
Rainbow manzanita *Arctostaphylos rainbowensis*	• Mitigation for this species will require in-kind preservation of individual plants at a 1:1 to 3:1 ratio. • Encroachment shall not exceed 20% of the population on-site.

Common Name ***Scientific Name***	**Mitigation Requirements***
Nevin's barberry *Berberis nevinii*	• Mitigation will require in-kind preservation of individual plants at a 3:1 ratio. • Encroachment shall not exceed 20% of the population on-site. • Other areas of the Park should be surveyed to identify populations within the Park for in-kind preservation. • Manage invasive plant species within proposed preservation areas. • Install split-rail fencing to restrict illegal encroachment into the preserved Nevin's barberry population. • Install signage along the fencing. • Install permanent markers to document the boundary of the preserved Nevin's barberry population.
Dunn's mariposa lily *Calochortus dunnii*	• Mitigation for these species will require in-kind preservation of individual plants at a 1:1 to 3:1 ratio. • Encroachment shall not exceed 20% of the population on-site.

Common Name ***Scientific Name***	**Mitigation Requirements***
Orcutt's pincushion *Chaenactis glabriuscula* var. *orcuttiana*	• Mitigation for these species will require in-kind preservation of individual plants at a 1:1 to 3:1 ratio. • Encroachment shall not exceed 20% of the population on-site.
Cuyamaca larkspur *Delphinium hesperium* ssp. *Cuyamacae*	
Mesa horkelia *Horkelia cuneata* ssp. *Puberula*	
Robinson's pepper-grass *Lepidium virginicum* var. *robinsonii*	
Lemon lily *Lilium parryi*	
Orcutt=s linanthus *Linanthus orcuttii*	
Felt-leaved monardella *Monardella hypoleuca* ssp. *lanata*	
Hall's monardella *Monardella macrantha* ssp. *hallii*	
San Felipe monardella *Monardella nana* ssp. *Leptosiphon*	
Chaparral nolina *Nolina cismontana*	
Southern skullcap *Scutellaria bolanderi* ssp. *austromontana*	
Parry's tetracoccus *Tetracoccus dioicus*	
San Bernardino aster *Symphyotrichum defoliatum*	• Mitigation for these species will require in-kind preservation of individual plants at a 1:1 to 3:1 ratio. • Encroachment shall not exceed 20% of the population on-site. • If development or clearing of habitat cannot be avoided, mitigation for these species will occur through habitat-based compensation (see Table 3).

Common Name *Scientific Name*	Mitigation Requirements*
Golden violet *Viola aurea*	• Mitigation for these species will require in-kind preservation of individual plants at a 1:1 to 3:1 ratio. • Encroachment shall not exceed 20% of the population on-site.

* Impacts to federally listed species will require consultation with the USFWS under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

Rationale: Mitigation of potential impacts to special status plant species can be achieved by implementing measures to avoid direct or indirect impacts to such species. Measures to avoid or minimize impacts will be included in construction plans and implemented prior to, during, and after construction. Specifically M-BI-1a requires the preparation of a Biological Resources Report prior to the development of Park facilities and requires the implementation of mitigation measures. M-BI-1d requires all facilities to be designed specifically to avoid disturbing or destroying special status plant species to the maximum extent practicable. Mitigation measure M-BI-1e would ensure that construction activities do not adversely impact biological resources by identifying such resources at the time of construction and restricting all construction activities with the potential for impacts to biological resources to locations where biological resources would not be harmed, with appropriate buffering of biological resources from such activities. Mitigation measure M-BI-1f would ensure that construction contractors and personnel are aware of the importance of avoiding sensitive biological resources and of the procedures required to do so. These mitigation measures have been incorporated into the proposed project to mitigate impacts to special status plant species to a less than significant level. (FEIR 2.3-26)

Significant Effect: Impact BI-2: Development of Tier A sites, Tier B sites, trails, and trail bridges has the potential to kill, injure, or disturb special status wildlife species that were present and could not escape. Clearing of vegetation for construction has the potential to affect nesting bird species, including raptors. Any such effects would be significant direct impacts. Special status wildlife could be killed, severely injured, or suffer a significant loss of habitat, resulting in a long-term impact. Special status wildlife species could be driven from habitat near the construction area by noise, equipment operation, and human activity, resulting in a short-term impact. A significant impact would result if the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS. A total of 29 sensitive wildlife species, including 3 amphibians, 5 reptiles, 16 birds, and 5 mammal species, are known to occur or have some potential to occur within the vicinity of the proposed Park. Ten sensitive animal species were observed during wildlife surveys and sensitive wildlife habitat assessment surveys for the

PEIR. The proposed Park contains critical habitat for three federally listed species: least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, and coastal California gnatcatcher. Four other federally or state listed species have a high potential to occur within the proposed Park. An additional 15 sensitive animal species have a potential to occur within the proposed Park. (FEIR Pages 2.3-6)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-BI-2a. See Mitigation Measure M-B-1a.

M-BI-2b. See Mitigation Measure M-B-1b.

M-BI-2c. See Mitigation Measure M-B-1d.

M-BI-2d. See Mitigation Measure M-B-1e.

M-BI-2e. Tier A sites shall be designed to avoid direct impacts to sensitive wildlife to the extent practicable based on historical information and a biological resource survey conducted within 1 year of the start of construction. The survey shall include directed surveys for the sensitive wildlife species expected to occur on the site as described in this PEIR. Development of Tier A sites shall avoid direct impacts to sensitive wildlife species and their habitat, including appropriate buffers, to the extent practicable.

M-BI-2f. If impacts to sensitive wildlife are unavoidable for any reason, mitigation shall be implemented as listed in Table 2, which includes habitat-based mitigation.

M-BI-2g. Removal of vegetation, including eucalyptus trees, shall be conducted outside the breeding season (defined as February 15-September 15). If vegetation removal outside the breeding season is not feasible, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey to identify if active nests are located within or adjacent to the proposed impact areas. If active nests are found during the pre-construction survey, a 500-foot buffer around the nest shall be established and no disturbance shall be allowed within the buffer until a qualified biologist determined that the nest is no longer active.

M-BI-2h. See mitigation measure M-BI-1f.

M-BI-2i. See mitigation measure M-BI-1g.

M-BI-2j. See mitigation measure M-BI-1h.

M-BI-2k. See mitigation measure M-BI-1i.

Table 2
Mitigation Requirements for Special Status Wildlife Species

Common Name ***Scientific Name***	**Mitigation Requirements***
Arroyo toad *Bufo californicus*	• Focused protocol surveys for this species should be conducted during the planning for the Tier A and Tier B sites. • All construction activities should occur outside of ponded areas, upland habitats, and trails known to support or with a potential to support arroyo toad. • If development or clearing of habitat cannot be avoided, compensation for wetland habitat will occur at a 2:1 ratio. Tadpoles within affected pools should be relocated. • Implement removal and management of invasive plant species. • Implement exotic predator (i.e., bullfrog, crayfish) control programs. • Enforce seasonal closures of trails or areas with known occurrences of burrowing juveniles and adults, and areas of adjacent potential breeding sites. • Restrict use of sites and trails to daylight hours, dawn to dusk. • Install barriers to keep people in designated park areas, which may include creating a habitat buffer with native vegetation, and/or installing fences, bollards, and rock barriers. • Shield lighting away from riparian habitats. • Use a timer to shut off all lights at the end of scheduled activities to minimize the time lights are used. • Install permanent BMPs to address water quality issues, including swales to treat water as it flows off-site. • Install exclusionary fences prior to construction in locations determined by a qualified biologist.
Western spadefoot toad *Spea hammondii*	
Large-blotched salamander	

Common Name ***Scientific Name***	**Mitigation Requirements***
Ensatina klauberi	• If development or clearing of habitat cannot be avoided, mitigation for these species will occur through habitat-based compensation (See Table 3).
Orange-throated whiptail *Aspidoscelis hyperythra*	
Coronado skink *Eumeces skiltonianus interparietalis*	
San Diego coast horned lizard *Phrynosoma coronatum blainvilli*	
Northern red-diamond rattlesnake *Crotalus ruber ruber*	
Southwestern pond turtle *Clemmys marmorata pallida*	
Least bittern *Ixobrychs exilis*	• If development or clearing of habitat cannot be avoided, mitigation for these species will occur through habitat-based compensation (see Table 3). • Any development or vegetation clearing should not occur within or adjacent to nesting habitat during the nesting season (February 15 - September 15).
White-faced ibis *Plegadis chihi*	
White-tailed kite *Elanus leucurus*	
Golden eagle *Aquila chrystaeos*	
Cooper's hawk *Accipiter cooperi*	
Northern harrier *Circus cyaneus*	
Coastal cactus wren *Campylorhynchus bruneicapillus sandiegensis*	
Bell's sage sparrow *Amphispiza belli belli*	• If development or clearing of habitat cannot be avoided, mitigation for these species will occur through habitat-based compensation (see Table 3. • Any development or vegetation clearing should not
Loggerhead shrike *Lanius ludovicanus*	
Yellow warbler *Dendroica petechia brewsteri*	

Common Name ***Scientific Name***	**Mitigation Requirements***
Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow *Aimophila ruficeps canescens*	occur within or adjacent to nesting habitat during the nesting season (February 15 - September 15). • Add nest boxes to provide nesting opportunities for these avian species as appropriate.
Yellow-breasted chat *Icteria virens*	
Coastal California gnatcatcher *Polioptila californica californica*	• Focused protocol surveys for this species should be conducted during the planning for Tier A and Tier B sites. • All construction activities should occur outside of coastal sage scrub habitats known to support or with a potential to support coastal California gnatcatcher. • If development or clearing of habitat cannot be avoided, compensation for coastal sage scrub habitat will occur at a 2:1 ratio. • Implement removal and management of invasive plant species. • Any development or vegetation clearing should not occur within or adjacent to nesting habitat during the nesting season (February 1 – August 31).
Belding's savannah sparrow *Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi*	• Focused protocol surveys for this species should be conducted during the planning for Tier A and Tier B sites. • All construction activities should occur outside of southern riparian scrub and southern cottonwood willow riparian forest known to support or with a potential to support Belding's savannah sparrow. • If development or clearing of habitat cannot be avoided, compensation for wetland habitat will occur at a 3:1 ratio. • Implement removal and management of invasive plant species. • Any development or vegetation clearing should not occur within or adjacent to nesting habitat during the nesting season (February 1 – August 31).

Common Name ***Scientific Name***	**Mitigation Requirements***
Southwestern willow flycatcher *Empidonax trailli extimus*	• Focused protocol surveys for this species should be conducted during the planning for Tier A and Tier B sites. • All construction activities should occur outside of southern riparian scrub and southern cottonwood willow riparian forest known to support or with a potential to support southwestern willow flycatcher. • If development or clearing of habitat cannot be avoided, compensation for wetland habitat will occur at a 3:1 ratio. • Implement removal and management of invasive plant species. • Implement exotic predator (i.e., brown-headed cowbird) control programs. • Any development or vegetation clearing should not occur within or adjacent to nesting habitat during the nesting season (May 1 – August 31).
Least Bell's vireo *Vireo belli pusillus*	• Focused protocol surveys for this species should be conducted during the planning for Tier A and Tier B sites. • All construction activities should occur outside of southern riparian scrub and southern cottonwood willow riparian forest known to support or with a potential to support least Bell's vireo. • If development or clearing of habitat cannot be avoided, compensation for wetland habitat will occur at a 2:1 ratio. • Implement removal and management of invasive plant species. • Implement exotic predator (i.e., brown-headed cowbird) control programs. • Any development or vegetation clearing should not occur within or adjacent to nesting habitat during the nesting season (March 15 – August 31).

Common Name *Scientific Name*	Mitigation Requirements
Western mastiff bat *Eumops perotis californicus*	• If development or clearing of habitat cannot be avoided, mitigation will occur through habitat-based compensation (see Table 3). • Add bat house structures to provide roosting opportunities for this species and other bat species.
San Diego desert woodrat *Neotoma lepida intermedia*	• If development or clearing of habitat cannot be avoided, mitigation for these species will occur through habitat-based compensation (see Table 3).
Dulzura pocket mouse *Chaetodipus califonicus femoralis*	
Northwestern San Diego pocket mouse *Chaetodipus fallax fallax*	
San Diego desert woodrat *Neotoma lepida intermedia*	
Dulzura pocket mouse *Chaetodipus califonicus femoralis*	
Stephens' kangaroo rat *Dipodomys stephensi*	• Focused habitat assessments and protocol-level surveys (if warranted) should be conducted for this species during the planning for Tier A, Tier B, and trail system sites, including bridges. • If this species is present, mitigation in the form of habitat preservation will be required. • If development or clearing of habitat cannot be avoided, mitigation of nonnative grassland habitat will occur at a 1.5:1 ratio. • Mitigation may also include trapping and relocation of individuals, and installation of exclusionary fencing.

* Impacts to federally listed species will require consultation with the USFWS under the ESA.

Rationale: In combination with mitigation measures M-BI-2a through M-BI-2d and M-BI-2h through M-BI-2k, mitigation measure M-BI-2e requires that development of Tier A sites, Tier B sites, trails, and trail bridges be designed specifically to avoid direct impacts to special status wildlife species to the extent practicable by identifying such resources at the time of construction and

restricting all construction activities to locations where impacts to sensitive wildlife species would not occur. Mitigation measure M-BI-2f also requires species-specific mitigation for any impacts to sensitive wildlife or sensitive wildlife habitat. Mitigation measure M-BI-2g requires avoidance of active nests through clearing outside the breeding season or conducting a pre-construction nesting bird survey. These mitigation measures have been incorporated into the proposed project and will reduce impacts of construction on special status wildlife species to a less than significant level. (FEIR 2.3-26)

Significant Effect: Impact BI-3: Construction and operation of the Tier A sites, Tier B sites, trails, and trail bridges could indirectly affect special status plant species through human and pet presence on and off the sites and trails, with the potential for noise and dust deposition, increased soil erosion, increased human and pet access and trampling, introduction of nonnative species, and increased potential of exotic species invasion due to soil disturbance, resulting in a significant indirect impact. Potential indirect impacts to special status plant species within a 100-foot buffer around Tier A sites; in any part of Tier A sites not affected by construction; and adjacent to Tier B sites, trails, and trail bridges could occur during construction and operation of the proposed Park. Construction and operation of the Tier A sites, Tier B sites, trails, and trail bridges could indirectly affect special status plant species through human and pet presence on and off the sites and trails, with the potential for noise and dust deposition, increased soil erosion, increased human and pet access and trampling, introduction of nonnative species, and increased potential of exotic species invasion due to soil disturbance. Construction has the potential to drive special status species from the construction area because of noise, equipment operation, and human activity. (FEIR 2.3-6)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-BI-3a. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a.

M-BI-3b. A conceptual Resource Management Plan shall be prepared, and approved by the Director of Parks and Recreation, for the proposed Park areas. The Plan shall include monitoring and adaptive management of park resources. The Resource Management Plan will be developed using the County's guidelines regarding the preparation of Resource Management Plan. In general the plan includes the purpose of the plan, implementation information including responsibilities and financial information, information on the property, the description of the biological resources on site emphasizing the overall biological value, and the management elements, goals and associated tasks. The plan will address the need to balance public access and recreational opportunities within

the park with the need for resource protection. The plan will also include performance standards for the protection and preservation of those resources. The plan will be developed once the initial acquisition of the site and specific site development planning has occurred and before construction of these activities begins.

M-BI-3c. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b.

M-BI-3d. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1d.

M-BI-3e. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1e.

M-BI-3f. The Director of Parks and Recreation shall inform prospective construction contractors or personnel, prior to the start of any construction on Tier A sites, Tier B sites, new trail routes, and trail bridges, about biological constraints on this project based on biological surveys conducted within 1 year of the start of construction. At least two surveys shall be conducted for each site, one during the spring and one during the summer. The surveys shall identify any special status plant species to be avoided during construction. These areas, including appropriate buffers, shall be flagged by a qualified biologist prior to the onset of construction activities. Where indicated by the biologist, these areas shall be fenced or otherwise protected from indirect impacts. All such areas to be avoided shall be clearly marked on construction plans and designated as “no construction” zones. If it is determined, after review by the Director of Parks and Recreation that impacts to special status plant species cannot be avoided for any reason, mitigation shall be required. Mitigation is listed for each plant species in Table 1.

M-BI-3g. During Park operation, fencing, vegetation, or other natural barriers shall be constructed if necessary to prevent indirect impacts to special status plant species within 100 feet of Tier A, Tier B, or trail sites. Signs shall be erected in appropriate locations to request Park visitors to stay in designated use areas. Operating procedures for the protection of special status plant species shall be reviewed yearly by a County biologist. If necessary, some trails and Tier B sites shall be closed seasonally to avoid indirect impacts to special status plant species.

M-BI-3h. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1d.

M-BI-3i. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1fg

M-BI-3j. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1h.

M-BI-3k. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1i.

M-BI-3l. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1j.

M-BI-3m. Erosion and siltation into off-site areas during construction will be minimized. An erosion control plan and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, as required by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) under the National Pollutant Discharge Prevention Program, will be required of the contractor. The contract supervisor will be responsible for ensuring that the erosion control plan is developed and implemented. The plan will include the use of hay bales, silt fences, siltation basins, or other devices necessary to stabilize the soil in denuded or graded areas during the construction and revegetation phases of the project.

Rationale: Incorporation of the these mitigation measures into the project will avoid indirect impacts of construction on special status plant species by identifying the locations of such species at the time of construction and restricting all construction activities to locations where impacts to special status plant species would not occur. These mitigation measures will reduce indirect impacts of construction and Park operation on special status plant species to a less than significant level. (FEIR 2.3-26)

Significant Effect: Impact BI-4: Activity associated with Park construction and operation such as noise, lighting, human activity, and predation by pets could have significant indirect impacts on wildlife on Tier A sites and in the 100-foot buffer areas, and near Tier B sites, trails, and trail bridges. Activity associated with Park construction and operation could have adverse effects on wildlife. Noise, lighting, human activity, and predation by pets are among the factors that could affect wildlife on Tier A sites and in the 100-foot Tier A buffer areas, and near Tier B sites, trails, and trail bridges. Such effects could kill or injure wildlife or render the habitat unsuitable. FEIR 2.3-6 – 2.3-7)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-BI-4a. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a.

M-BI-4b. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-3c.

M-BI-4c. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1c.

M-BI-4d. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1e.

M-BI-4e. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1f.

M-BI-4f. The Director of Parks and Recreation shall inform prospective construction contractors or personnel, prior to the start of any construction on Tier A sites, Tier B sites, new trail routes, and trail bridges, about biological constraints on this project based on biological surveys conducted within 1 year of the start of construction. The surveys shall identify any sensitive wildlife habitat to be avoided during construction. These areas, including appropriate buffers, shall be flagged by a qualified biologist prior to the onset of construction activities. Where indicated by the biologist, these areas shall be fenced or otherwise protected from direct or indirect impacts. All such areas to be avoided shall be clearly marked on construction plans and designated as "no construction" zones. If it is determined, after review by the Director of Parks and Recreation that impacts to sensitive wildlife species or habitat cannot be avoided for any reason, or if inadvertent impacts occur during construction, mitigation shall be required. Mitigation is listed for each sensitive wildlife species in Table 2.

M-BI-4g. During Park operation, any lights needed to illuminate the staging area, sports/recreational fields, interpretive garden, or parking lots shall be directed away from the adjacent habitat for sensitive wildlife. Fencing, vegetation, or other natural barriers shall be constructed to prevent indirect impacts to sensitive wildlife habitat adjacent to Tier A, Tier B, or trail sites. Signs shall be erected in appropriate locations to inform Park visitors of the need to stay in designated use areas and of appropriate behaviors and noise levels when near sensitive biological areas. Operating procedures for the protection of sensitive wildlife habitat shall be reviewed yearly by a County biologist. If necessary, some trails and Tier B sites shall be closed seasonally to avoid indirect impacts to sensitive resources. Any impacts to sensitive wildlife or sensitive wildlife habitat occurring during Park operation shall be mitigated as listed in Table 2.

M-BI-4h. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1f.

M-BI-4i. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1g.

M-BI-4j. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1h.

M-BI-4k. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1i.

M-BI-4l. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-3m.

Rationale: Incorporation of the these mitigation measures into the project will avoid indirect impacts of construction on sensitive wildlife species by identifying the locations of sensitive species habitat at the time of construction, and restricting all construction activities to locations where impacts to sensitive wildlife species would not occur. These mitigation measures will reduce indirect impacts of construction and Park operation on sensitive wildlife species to a less than significant level. (FEIR Page 2.3-26)

Significant Effect: Impact BI-5: Restoration activities within the Preserve have the potential to impact the arroyo toad or convert suitable upland toad habitat such that it would become unsuitable for the species, resulting in a significant impact. Restoration or revegetation of native habitat in the Preserve could involve ground disturbance, including clearing of vegetation, grading, and planting. Because of these activities, restoration activities would have the potential to kill, injure, or disturb the arroyo toad, listed by USFWS as endangered and a CDFG species of special concern, or to alter toad habitat. The Master Plan requires all activities in the Park, including restoration and mitigation, to avoid or minimize impacts to special status species. Nonetheless, restoration/revegetation activities could kill, injure, or disturb arroyo toads that are present and unable to escape.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-BI-5a. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a.

M-BI-5b. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-3b.

M-BI-5c. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b.

M-BI-5d. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1d.

M-BI-5e. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1e.

M-BI-5f. Prior to the implementation of any revegetation, a Revegetation Plan shall be prepared and approved by the Director of Parks and Recreation. The Plan shall detail the proposed revegetation and associated success criteria. In addition the revegetation plan will include performance standards for the removal of non-native species, soil preparation, irrigation, plant replacement, fencing, signage, and litter removal. Toad-exclusion fencing and toad monitoring will be required for all revegetation efforts within occupied arroyo toad habitat.

M-BI-5g. Revegetation/restoration areas shall be sited to avoid adverse impacts to the arroyo toad and suitable/occupied toad upland (and breeding) habitat.

M-BI-5h. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1f.

M-BI-5i. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1g.

M-BI-5j. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1h.

M-BI-5k. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1i.

M-BI-5l. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-3m.

Rationale: Implementation of mitigation measures M-BI-5a through M-BI-5l will avoid direct impacts on the arroyo toad or on suitable habitat for this species resulting from Park restoration/revegetation activities. In particular, mitigation measure M-BI-5g requires that restoration areas be sited to avoid impact to the arroyo toad, and mitigation measure M-BI-5f requires the preparation of an approved Revegetation Plan prior to the implementation of revegetation activities. Incorporation of these measures reduces impacts on the arroyo toad to a less than significant level. (FEIR Page 2.3-27)

Significant Effect: Impact BI-6: Restoration activities within the Preserve have the potential to impact nesting raptors (and other birds) through removal of vegetation, including eucalyptus trees supporting active nests, resulting in a significant impact. Several species of raptors and other birds are known to use trees in the Park area, including nonnative species such as eucalyptus, for nesting. Restoration of native species and habitats could involve the removal of trees suitable for nesting, resulting in a significant impact on species that might be nesting in the trees.(FEIR 2.3-7)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-BI-6a. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a.

M-BI-6b. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b.

M-BI-6c. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1d.

M-BI-6d. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1e.

M-BI-6e. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-2g.

M-BI-6f. Prior to the implementation of any revegetation, a Revegetation Plan shall be prepared and approved by the Director of Parks and Recreation. The Plan shall detail the proposed revegetation and associated success criteria. The revegetation plan will include performance standards for the removal of non-native species, soil preparation, irrigation, plant replacement, fencing, signage, and litter removal. The revegetation plan will include a requirement for raptor surveys prior to the removal of non-native trees that may provide nesting and

perching areas for raptors. The removal of vegetation will be prohibited during the bird breeding season (March 1 – August 31).

M-BI-6g. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1g.

Rationale: Implementation of these mitigation measures will prevent impacts to nesting raptors and other birds. These measures require avoidance of disturbing activities near active nesting areas and require vegetation clearing outside the breeding season, or the completion of a pre-construction nesting bird survey, to ensure impacts are avoided. Incorporation of these measures into the project will reduce potential impacts to nesting birds/raptors to below a level of significance. (FEIR 2.3-27)

Significant Effect: Impact BI-7: Construction of Tier A sites, Tier B sites, trails, and trail bridges could adversely affect sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters, resulting in a significant impact. Based on available regional data and the biological resource surveys conducted for the proposed project, several types of sensitive vegetation communities occur in the proposed Park, including various types of wetlands and rare upland habitats. Construction may alter, disturb, or destroy sensitive vegetation, including a number of natural communities and waters of the U.S., wetlands, and riparian habitats. (FEIR Pages 2.3-8 – 2.3-9)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-BI-7a. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a.

M-BI-7b. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-3b.

M-BI-7c. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b.

M-BI-7d. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1d.

M-BI-7e. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1e.

M-BI-7f. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1f.

M-BI-7g. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1g.

M-BI-7h. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1h.

M-BI-7i. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-1i.

M-BI-7j. See Mitigation Measure M-BI-3m.

M-BI-7k. The Director of Parks and Recreation shall inform prospective construction contractors or personnel, prior to the start of any construction on Tier A sites, Tier B sites, new trail routes, and trail bridges, about biological constraints based on biological surveys, including a wetland delineation, conducted within 1 year of the start of construction. Sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters within 200 feet of construction areas shall be identified. Construction within 200 feet of sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters shall be avoided to the maximum extent possible. The limits of construction for the 200-foot buffer shall be identified prior to the start of construction and shall be flagged or otherwise marked by a qualified biologist and contractor or fenced if the biologist deems it necessary.

M-BI-7l. If construction impacts to sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters are unavoidable or accidentally occur during construction, impacts shall be mitigated on- or off-site at the ratios listed in Table 3. First choice for mitigation sites shall be on-site restoration of disturbed habitat, or purchase and preservation of existing in-kind habitat or out-of-kind habitat. If mitigation on-site is infeasible, off-site mitigation must be implemented. First choice for off-site mitigation is within the proposed Park area. Second choice is elsewhere in the San Luis Rey River watershed as near to the proposed Park as possible.

Table 3
Mitigation Requirements for Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types

Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types	Mitigation Ratio
Wetlands	
Freshwater	2:1
Nonvegetated channel	2:1
Coastal and valley freshwater marsh	2:1
Southern arroyo willow riparian forest	2:1
Southern cottonwood willow riparian forest	2:1
Southern sycamore alder riparian woodland	2:1
Southern riparian scrub	2:1
Southern willow scrub	2:1
Mule fat scrub	2:1
Native Uplands	
Diegan coastal sage scrub (including disturbed)	2:1

Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types	Mitigation Ratio
Alluvial fan scrub	2:1
Southern mixed chaparral	2:1
Valley and foothill grassland	2:1
Coast live oak woodland	2:1
Dense coast live oak woodland	2:1
Open coast live oak woodland	2:1
Nonnative / Disturbed uplands	
Eucalyptus woodland	NA
Disturbed habitat	NA
General agriculture	NA
Orchards and vineyards	NA
Intensive agriculture	NA
Extensive agriculture	NA
Field/Pasture	NA
Row crops	NA
Nonnative grassland	0.5:1

* Nonnative/disturbed uplands containing suitable arroyo toad upland aestivation
habitat will require mitigation at a ratio of 1:1.

M-BI-7m. All plans for Park development shall include the implementation of all possible and practical measures to avoid indirect impacts to sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters. During Park operation, any lights needed to illuminate the staging area, sports/recreational fields, interpretive garden, or parking lots shall be directed away from the adjacent riparian area. Fencing, vegetation, or other natural barriers shall be constructed to prevent indirect impacts to sensitive vegetation or habitat adjacent to Tier A, Tier B, or trail sites. Signs shall be erected in appropriate locations to inform Park visitors of appropriate behaviors and noise levels when near sensitive biological areas. Operating procedures for the protection of sensitive resources shall be reviewed yearly by a County biologist. If necessary, some trails and Tier B sites shall be closed seasonally to avoid indirect impacts to sensitive resources. In addition, all mitigation measures mentioned above should be implemented to avoid indirect impacts to sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters.

Rationale: Incorporation of these mitigation measures into the project will avoid direct impacts on sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters by restricting construction activity from any area within 200 feet of such resources if practical. If impacts to such resources are unavoidable, replacement will be required at a location on or off-site at ratios appropriate to the resource. These measures will reduce direct impacts of construction on sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters to a less than significant level. FEIR Page 2.3-27)

Significant Effect: Impact BI-8: Noise and dust deposition, increased soil erosion, increased human and pet access and trampling, introduction of nonnative species, and increased potential of exotic species invasion due to soil disturbance affecting sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters may occur within Tier A buffers and from development of Tier A sites, Tier B sites, trails, and bridges, resulting in a significant indirect impact. Federal wetlands and waters that were preserved within the Tier A sites and within the 100-foot buffer areas could be subject to indirect effects of Park construction and implementation. Significant indirect impacts could include noise and dust deposition, increased soil erosion, increased human and pet access and trampling, introduction of nonnative species, and increased potential of exotic species invasion due to soil disturbance. The same indirect impacts could affect federal wetlands and waters near Tier B sites, trails, and trail bridges. (FEIR Pages 2.3-9 – 2.3-10)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-BI-8a. See mitigation measure M-BI-1a.

M-BI-8b. See mitigation measure M-BI-1b.

M-BI-8c. See mitigation measure M-BI-1d.

M-BI-8d. See mitigation measure M-BI-1e.

M-BI-8e. See mitigation measure M-BI-1f.

M-BI-8f. See mitigation measure M-BI-1g.

M-BI-8g. See mitigation measure M-BI-1h.

M-BI-8h. See mitigation measure M-BI-1i.

M-BI-8i. See mitigation measure M-BI-3m.

M-BI-8j. See mitigation measure M-BI-7k.

M-BI-8k. See mitigation measure M-BI-7l.

M-BI-8l. See mitigation measure M-BI-7m.

Rationale: Incorporation of these mitigation measures into the project will avoid indirect impacts of development of the Park on sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters by employing operating procedures to restrict Park features and activities from affecting sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters, and by implementing a yearly review of protective measures. These measures will reduce indirect impacts of Park operation on sensitive natural communities, riparian habitats, and federal wetlands and waters to a less than significant level. (FEIR Page 2.3-27)

3. Cultural Resources

Significant Effect: Impact CR-1: Construction of Tier A sites, Tier B sites, and trails and Park operations could adversely affect known significant historical resources and historical sites that have not been identified. Development within the proposed Park would be sited and designed to avoid the three historical architectural resources that have been recorded within the project area: Gird House, Bonsall Creek Bridge, and San Luis Rey Bridge. There may be, however, historical resources in other parts of the proposed Park that have not been previously recorded. Direct impacts could occur to any such sites as a result of construction activity that would disturb or destroy all or part of the sites. Indirect impacts from construction and park use could result from increased access to possible historical sites leading to inadvertent or deliberate adverse actions such as trespass or vandalism, despite oversight from County Department of Parks and Recreation operational staff. Multi-use trail locations are conceptual at this stage of the project, but they can be designed to avoid providing public access near known historical resources and sites. Despite these measures for protecting historical resources, significant impacts to historical resources could still result. (FEIR Pages 2.4-7 – 2.4-8)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-CR-1a. Prior to Director of Parks and Recreation approval of construction plans for Park facilities, a Cultural Resources Report meeting County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Guidelines for Cultural Resources standards shall be prepared to evaluate specific locations of Tier A facilities, Tier B facilities, trails, and restoration areas; identify potential significant impacts to historical built environment resources and cultural resources; and recommend appropriate mitigation. Mitigation measures to be incorporated and implemented shall reduce all significant impacts to a less than significant level.

M-CR-1b. When areas that will be affected by construction of Tier A sites, Tier B sites, trail alignments, and bridges are finalized, site-specific historical resource surveys shall be conducted. The surveys shall cover all areas within 100 feet of the proposed development footprint. If a previous survey has been conducted for the site within 5 years of submittal, the Director of Parks and Recreation may make a determination that the previous survey is adequate and no site-specific survey is required.

M-CR-1c. In the event of discovery of any important historical resources, avoidance shall be the preferred treatment option. Avoidance strategies may include project redesign or relocation of facilities, capping site areas with culturally sterile fill, and restricting access through fencing or other means.

M-CR-1d. For historical resources that cannot be avoided, the resource shall be evaluated for historical significance. A resource shall be considered significant if it meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resource Code Section 5024.1).

M-CR-1e. A data recovery program directed by a site-specific research design document shall be developed and implemented by a qualified historian and approved by the Director of Parks and Recreation for any significant historical resource for which avoidance is not feasible. These investigations will be directed at recovering significant information that will be lost as a result of impacts to the site. The document shall discuss the historical context, consider research issues to be addressed, identify specific field and analytical methods to be implemented, and provide for curation of collected materials in accordance with Secretary of Interior Standards (36 CFR Part 79).

M-CR-1f. Any historical resources within 100 feet of Park facilities shall be evaluated for educational and interpretive value. The first priority shall be to preserve the integrity of the resource. If educational and interpretive functions cannot be implemented without reasonable potential for harm to the resource, Tier B and multi-use trails shall be relocated to provide a 100-foot buffer, including access restrictions, such as fencing or vegetation, from Park use areas.

Rationale: Incorporation of these mitigation measures into the project will avoid impacts of development of the Park to historical resources. These mitigation measures are based on accepted practice for impacts to cultural resources under CEQA and County policies for the adequate mitigation of impacts. They are designed to avoid disturbance, destruction, or harm to historical resources or sites from Park construction and operation. Avoidance and preservation of the resource is the preferred option and, if implemented, would result in no significant impact to cultural resources. If historical resources cannot be avoided, mitigation measures are incorporated into the project that will maintain the informational and research value by requiring a data recovery program and curation of collected materials according to CEQA and County standards. In addition, these

measures require the preparation of a technical report per County guidelines to document educational and interpretative value of the find to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. (FEIR Page 2.4-14)]

Significant Effect: Impact CR-2: Construction and Park operation could adversely affect known archaeological sites, or undiscovered surface or subsurface archaeological resources. Grading, ground disturbance, or Park operations may have the potential for an adverse effect on undiscovered surface or subsurface archaeological resources at or adjacent to Tier A and Tier B sites. Park construction could directly destroy or disturb known archaeological sites or potential surface and subsurface archaeological resources in the vicinity of Tier A sites, Tier B sites, and the trail system (including potential trail bridges). Construction and operation of the Park have the potential to cause indirect adverse impacts to archaeological resources in the vicinity of any of these Park components through increased human access to the resources.(FEIR Page 2.4-9)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-CR-2a. Tier A sites, Tier B sites, new trail routes, and trail bridges shall be designed to avoid all cultural sites. Specific avoidance measures should be developed in consultation with a qualified archaeologist and appropriate Native American entities. Avoidance strategies will be developed on a site-specific basis but may include such measures as redesign or relocation of development facilities, realignment of trails, capping site areas with sterile fill, or restricting access through fencing or other means. No construction activity shall be allowed within 100 feet of boundaries of any archaeological site and buffer area, which shall be marked as a “no construction” zone on grading plans.

M-CR-2b. See Mitigation Measure M-CR-1a.

M-CR-2c. When the areas that will be affected by construction of Tier A sites, Tier B sites, and trail alignments are finalized, site-specific archaeological resource surveys shall be conducted. A Native American monitor shall be present during site surveys. The surveys shall cover all areas within 100 feet of Tier A sites, Tier B sites, and trails, including bridge construction sites. If a previous survey has been conducted for the site within 5 years of submittal, the Director of Parks and Recreation may make a determination that the previous survey is adequate and no site-specific survey is required.

M-CR-2d. Prior to any ground-disturbing activity at Tier A sites, Tier B sites, and the multi-use trails, a monitoring and data recovery plan for potential subsurface

resources shall be developed in coordination with a Native American representative. The plan should identify the areas to be monitored; procedures to be followed in the event of a significant cultural discovery; and procedures for protection, evaluation, and curation of the find. A qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor shall be present during ground-disturbing activities at these Park facilities and as outlined in the monitoring and data recovery plan. If a possible archaeological deposit is identified during monitoring, the work will be temporarily halted at the location while the find is assessed. If it is determined to be an archaeological deposit, the work will be redirected while notification and evaluation procedures are initiated. When a discovery is made that requires further investigation, notification procedures as outlined in the monitoring and discovery plan will be initiated.

M-CR-2e. In the event of discovery of important archaeological resources, avoidance shall be the preferred treatment option. The discovery will be protected as appropriate and evaluated in consultation with the Director of Parks and Recreation and Native American monitors. Avoidance strategies may include project redesign or relocation of facilities, capping site areas with culturally sterile fill, and restricting access through fencing or other means. If avoidance is not feasible, testing and data recovery procedures will be implemented.

M-CR-2f. For archaeological resources that cannot be avoided, the resource shall be evaluated for significance. A resource shall be considered significant if it meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR (Public Resource Code Section 5024.1). This is typically assessed through application of standard archaeological techniques that include surface collections; detailed recoding of features; controlled subsurface investigations; and specialized analyses of artifacts, faunal remains, plant remains, and radiocarbon samples. Evaluations of site significance shall also take into account the recommendations of Native American consultants and shall consider the potential for historic or archaeological districts.

M-CR-2g. A data recovery program directed by a site-specific research design document shall be developed by a qualified archaeologist and approved by the Director of Parks and Recreation for any significant archaeological resource for which avoidance is not feasible. The document shall discuss the cultural context, consider research issues to be addressed, identify specific field and analytical methods to be implemented, include any input from Native American cultural representatives, and provide for curation of collected materials according to Secretary of Interior Standards (36 CFR Part 79). Every effort shall be made to have all ground disturbance associated with the data recovery monitored by a Native American. Results of the data recovery shall be documented in a technical report approved by the Director of Parks and Recreation.

M-CR-2h. Any archaeological resources within 100 feet of Park facilities shall be evaluated for educational and interpretive value in consultation with local Native American entities. The first priority shall be to preserve the integrity of the resource. If educational and interpretive functions cannot be implemented without reasonable potential for harm to the resource, Tier B sites and multi-use trails shall be relocated to provide a 100-foot buffer, including access restrictions such as fencing or vegetation, from Park use areas. In addition, Native American entities will be provided with the opportunity to provide information about the tribal groups using interpretative plaques or other media within the Park boundaries.

Rationale: Incorporation of these mitigation measures into the project are designed to avoid impacts from development of the Park to cultural resources, by avoiding disturbance and destruction from Park construction and operation. Avoidance and preservation of the resource is the preferred option and, if implemented, would result in no significant impact to cultural resources. If cultural resources cannot be avoided, mitigation measures are incorporated into the project that will maintain the informational and research value by requiring a data recovery program and curation of collected materials according to CEQA and County standards. In addition, these measures require the preparation of a technical report per County guidelines to document educational and interpretative value of the find. These measures will reduce impacts to below a level of significance. (FEIR Page 2.4-14)

Significant Effect: Impact CR-3: Construction could inadvertently result in the disturbance of human remains, resulting in a significant impact. The evaluation of evidence for human remains for the PEIR consisted of a review of record searches. Human remains, apparently from a cremation site, were recorded for one archaeological site located within the proposed Park. Two other sites within the area covered by the record searches mentioned osteological artifacts that might indicate human remains. Human remains could be inadvertently encountered during development of the Park. (FEIR Page 2.4-9)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-CR-3. Tier A sites, Tier B sites, and trail routes will be designed to avoid areas with potential to unearth human remains. If human remains are discovered during monitoring, the provisions of the California Public Resources Code Section 5097 and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 will be implemented. Initially the remains will be stabilized and protected and the County Coroner will be contacted. If the remains are determined to be Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will be notified and will identify the MLD.

The Director of Parks and Recreation will consult with the MLD regarding the disposition of the remains.

Rationale: The mitigation measure will ensure that if human remains are encountered, they will be treated with dignity and respect, including consulting with a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) if the remains are Native American. This mitigation measure will reduce impacts related to finding human remains to below a level of significance. (FEIR Page 2.4-14)

5. Geological Resources

Significant Effect: Impact GE-1: Development that requires grading for Tier A sites, Tier B sites, and the trail system with cuts more than 1 foot deep could encounter erodible soils that would form an unstable base for Park development, resulting in a significant impact. The soils within the proposed Park boundaries range from slight to severe in erodibility, and some soils could have severe constraints for development of Park facilities. Soils in most of the proposed Park may also be subject to settlement under loads such as parking lots and buildings. Development of Park facilities should therefore require site-specific geotechnical investigation and possibly remedial grading when particular uses are proposed. (FEIR Pages 2.2-4 – 2.2-5)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-GE-1. Since the uses proposed in the Master Plan are conceptual, geological conditions that will be encountered in development of the Park cannot be specifically identified at this time. Prior to grading for any park facilities that will result in cuts more than 1 foot deep, site-specific engineering measures shall be identified to address soils suitability hazards. A geotechnical report shall be prepared for the plans of any such facility. The report shall be based on a site reconnaissance with testing of soils as deemed necessary and shall contain recommendations that shall be incorporated into the project before the approval of the construction plans for any remedial action to achieve adequate soil stability. Engineering details and specifications shall include those deemed appropriate by the County Director of Parks and Recreation and shall be included in the construction contract and listed on project plans.

Rationale: Remediation measures for soil stability and geological conditions associated with the proposed Park are standardized and effective. Such measures are project-specific and depend not only on the characteristics of the site but also on the nature of the proposed development. Therefore, geotechnical surveys must be prepared when specific development plans are

available. The mitigation measure will also require a geotechnical report with mitigation recommendations for each park facility, based on site-specific and project-specific geotechnical report. These recommendations will be incorporated into construction plans to reduce potential soil stability impacts to a less than significant level. (FEIR Pages 2.2-10 - 2.2-11)

Significant Effect: **Impact GE-2: Additional earthwork, erosion, construction of abutments, settlement, and corrosion associated with construction of the potential trail bridges could aggravate adverse geologic conditions, resulting in a significant impact.** Two to three bridges across the river may also be constructed in conjunction with the trail system. These bridges will most likely be made of prefabricated modular steel and be several hundred feet long, requiring reinforced concrete support columns. If placed in unstable soils, these columns could provide an unstable foundation for bridges, requiring remedial earthwork. Additional earthwork, erosion, construction of abutments, settlement, and corrosion could aggravate these geologic conditions. (FEIR Page 2.2-5)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-GE-2. Prior to engineering design of the trail bridges, a geotechnical report shall be prepared for the plans of the bridges with site-specific engineering measures to address potential geotechnical issues. The report shall be based on a site reconnaissance with testing of soils and geological formations as deemed necessary and shall contain recommendations that shall be incorporated into the project before the approval of the construction plans to achieve adequate bridge stability. Engineering details and specifications shall include those deemed appropriate by the County Engineer and shall be included in the contract for bridge construction and listed on project plans.

Rationale: Remediation measures for geological conditions are site-specific and depend not only on the characteristics of the site but also on the nature of the proposed development. Therefore, geotechnical surveys must be prepared when specific development plans are available. The mitigation measure will also require preparation of a geotechnical report with mitigation requirements for each trail bridge, based on site-specific and project development-specific geotechnical reports, to reduce potential soil and geology impacts for construction of the trail bridges to a less than significant level. (FEIR Pages 2.2-10 - 2.2-11)

6. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Significant Effect: Impact HZ-1: Exposure of workers to residual hazardous materials from past agricultural use is possible during Park construction and operation, resulting in a significant impact. Areas within the Park boundary have the potential to have been historically farmed or used for other agricultural purposes in the past. Therefore, there is a potential for pesticides, fertilizers, and other potentially hazardous materials to have been stored or used on-site because of past agricultural uses. During construction of Tier A sites, Tier B sites, and the trail system, exposure of workers to residual hazardous materials from past agricultural use or illegal dumping could result in a significant direct short-term impact. (FEIR Pages 2.5-5 - 2.5-7)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-HZ-1a. The contracts for construction of the Park facilities shall specify that any debris discovered within the proposed Tier A sites, Tier B sites, or trail system during construction that could be potentially classified as hazardous shall be removed and disposed of in compliance with regulatory guidelines.

M-HZ-1b. The contracts for construction of Park facilities shall specify that if other possible contamination sources, such as underground facilities, buried debris, stained or odorous soils, or waste containers are encountered during construction, appropriate further investigation and analysis shall be performed and any contaminated materials shall be disposed of according to regulatory guidelines.

Rationale: Incorporation of the mitigation measures into the project will eliminate potential exposure of construction workers and future Park users to hazards that could be associated with residual chemicals from past agricultural use or illegal dumping in active or passive use areas. Any such materials will be removed and disposed of according to proper regulatory procedures. Debris that might be hazardous will be removed from the site during construction, and buried hazardous materials encountered during construction will also be removed. These mitigation measures will reduce impacts to a less than significant level. (FEIR Page 2.5-11)

7. Noise

Significant Effect: Impact NO-1: If noise-sensitive wildlife species are present within 300 feet of the construction areas for Tier A sites, Tier B sites, trails, or trail bridges, those species could be affected by noise in excess of 60 dBA L_{eq} , resulting in a significant impact There are no County or state standards for noise levels affecting threatened or endangered species.

The County Guidelines for Determining Significance for biological resources states that a 1997 Bioacoustics Research Team study concluded that 60 dBA is a single, simple criterion to use for impacts to passerine bird species. Since threatened or endangered species found in the San Luis Rey River valley include passerine bird species such as least Bell's vireo and coastal California gnatcatcher, 60 dBA is the guideline used for significant impacts to sensitive species habitat. The average hourly noise level from construction activities, 75 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet, would attenuate to 60 dBA L_{eq} at 300 feet from the source. (FEIR Page 2.6-2)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-NO-1: The following measures are required to avoid impacts to noise-sensitive species during construction:

- Construction on any Park facility, including vegetation clearing, shall be limited to nonbreeding periods (February 15 to September 15).
- If construction is necessary during breeding periods, biological surveys shall be conducted to determine if any noise-sensitive threatened or endangered species are present within 300 feet of proposed construction limits. If noise-sensitive species are present, a detailed noise study shall be performed for the subject site to determine anticipated construction noise levels within the habitat areas and at known nesting sites, and appropriate mitigation shall be incorporated into construction requirements to reduce those noise levels to equal the ambient noise level or 60 dBA L_{eq}, whichever is higher.

Rationale: The mitigation measure will either prohibit construction near habitat for noise-sensitive species during the breeding season or ensure that construction noise levels above 60 dBA will not affect noise-sensitive wildlife species during construction. The measure will therefore reduce potential noise impacts on noise-sensitive species to a less than significant level. (FEIR Page 2.6-9)

Significant Effect: Impact NO-2: If located closer than 200 feet to residential property or closer than 75 feet to noise-sensitive habitat, a dog park could cause a significant adverse noise impact. A dog park is one of the Tier A uses anticipated in the Master Plan for the Park. The dog park sound level is derived from measurements taken in 2005 at the Balboa Dog Park, which indicated that a representative noise level from a dog park is approximately 65 dBA at 50 feet. If located closer than 200 feet to residential property or closer than 75 feet to noise-sensitive habitat, a dog park could cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity or expose

habitat suitable for threatened or endangered species. A substantial noise increase is defined as a 5 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) increase in areas that currently do not exceed 60 dBA CNEL, or a 3 dBA CNEL increase in areas that currently exceed 60 dBA CNEL. (FEIR Page 2.6-4 – 2.6-5)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-NO-2. A dog park shall not be located less than 200 feet from the nearest residential property line nor less than 75 feet from habitat for noise-sensitive wildlife species.

Rationale: The mitigation measure will ensure that dog parks within the Park will be located a sufficient distance from off-site residential uses and from on or off-site habitat for noise-sensitive species to allow attenuation by distance to levels that will meet standard limits for those uses: 67 dBA for on-site use areas and off-site residential uses, and 60 dBA for noise sensitive habitats. With implementation of this mitigation measure, on-site use areas and off-site residential uses will not be exposed to noise levels in access of 67 dBA L_{eq}, ambient noise levels will not be substantially increased, and habitat suitable for threatened or endangered species will not be exposed to noise levels in excess of 60 dBA L_{eq}. The mitigation measure will therefore reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. (FEIR 2.6-9)

Significant Effect: Impact NO-3: If located closer than 65 feet to residential property or closer than 25 feet to noise-sensitive habitat, parking lots could cause a significant adverse noise impact. The Master Plan anticipates parking lots located at Tier A sites. A representative parking lot sound level is derived from U.S. Department of Transportation studies that indicate representative noise from parking lots to be 53 dBA at 50 feet. If located closer than 65 feet to residential property or closer than 25 feet to noise-sensitive habitat, parking lots could cause noise that would exceed the limits used in the PEIR for significant effects. (FEIR Page 2.6-25)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-NO-3. Parking lots shall not be located less than 65 feet from the nearest residential property line nor less than 25 feet from habitat for noise-sensitive wildlife species unless a detailed noise study is conducted that determines that

placement of parking lots closer than the distances specified above will not result in noise levels that exceed 67 dBA at the nearest residential property line or 60 dBA from noise-sensitive habitat, or appropriate mitigation measures, including permanent noise barriers, can be incorporated to reduce noise levels to equal the ambient noise level or referenced thresholds for residential property and noise sensitive habitat.

Rationale: This mitigation measure will ensure that parking lots within the Park will be located a sufficient distance from off-site residential uses and from on or off-site habitat for noise-sensitive species to allow attenuation by distance to levels that will meet standard limits for those uses: 67 dBA for on-site use areas and off-site residential uses, and 60 dBA for noise sensitive habitats. With implementation of this mitigation measure, on-site use areas and off-site residential uses will not be exposed to noise levels in access of 67 dBA L_{eq}, ambient noise levels will not be substantially increased, and habitat suitable for threatened or endangered species will not be exposed to noise levels in excess of 60 dBA L_{eq}. The mitigation measure will therefore reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. (FEIR Page 2.6-9)

Significant Effect: Impact NO-4: If located closer than 125 feet to residential property or closer than 50 feet to noise-sensitive habitat, playing fields could cause a significant adverse noise impact. The Master Plan anticipates a number of playing fields for football, baseball, and soccer located at Tier A sites. Playing field sound level measurements taken by EDAW in 2005 at soccer fields in El Cajon indicate that playing fields typically produce a sound level of 60 dBA at 50 feet. If located closer than 125 feet to residential property or closer than 50 feet to noise-sensitive habitat, a playing field could cause noise exceeding the limits used in the PEIR for significant effects. (FEIR Page 2.6-5)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-NO-4. Playing fields shall not be located less than 125 feet from the nearest residential property line nor less than 50 feet from habitat for noise-sensitive wildlife species unless a detailed noise study is conducted that determines that placement of playing fields closer than the distances specified above will not result in noise levels that exceed 67 dBA at the nearest residential property line or 60 dBA from noise-sensitive habitat, or appropriate mitigation measures, including permanent noise barriers, can be incorporated to reduce noise levels to equal the ambient noise level or referenced thresholds for residential property and noise sensitive habitat.

Rationale: The mitigation measure will ensure that playing fields within the Park will be located a sufficient distance from off-site residential uses and from on or off-site habitat for noise-sensitive species to allow attenuation by distance to levels that will meet standard limits for those uses: 67 dBA for on-site use areas and off-site residential uses, and 60 dBA for noise sensitive habitats. With implementation of this mitigation measure, on-site use areas and off-site residential uses will not be exposed to noise levels in access of 67 dBA L_{eq}, ambient noise levels will not be substantially increased, and habitat suitable for threatened or endangered species will not be exposed to noise levels in excess of 60 dBA L_{eq}. The mitigation measure will therefore reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. (FEIR Page 2.6-9)

Significant Effect: Impact NO-5: Future project sites closer than 500 feet to Park construction sites and under construction at the same time could cause significant cumulative noise impacts. For substantial cumulative noise effects to occur from the combination of two projects constructed simultaneously, the two projects would have to be within 500 feet of each other. A receptor located equidistant from two noise sources would experience a maximum increase of approximately 1 dBA or less from both noise sources combined, compared to noise from only one source. A 1 dBA increase is barely perceptible to persons of normal hearing, so only project sites under construction at the same time and closer than 500 feet to Park construction sites could contribute to cumulative impacts of Park construction. (FEIR Page 2.6-6)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-NO-5. When development plans for future Park sites are brought forward, the Director of Parks and Recreation shall determine if future construction of other projects would occur within 500 feet of the Park construction site and would occur at the same time. The Director of Parks and Recreation shall also determine whether any sensitive receptor would be located within 500 feet of both construction sites. If so, a noise study shall be performed to determine if there would be a significant cumulative noise impact to any sensitive receptor by the standards of the County Noise Ordinance and to require appropriate mitigation. Appropriate mitigation would consist of scheduling construction to avoid simultaneous generation of noise or the use of physical barriers to attenuate noise.

Rationale: This mitigation measure is designed to ensure that cumulative noise impacts will not occur by avoiding simultaneous generation of construction noise by subsequent Park projects and other projects, and by employing physical attenuation or other appropriate mitigation to reduce combined impacts so that

no sensitive receptors will be impacted by such noise. The mitigation measure will therefore reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. (FEIR Page 2.6-9)

8. Public Services

Significant Effect: **Impact PS-1: Implementation of the Park Master Plan would result in the extension of water and sewer pipe connections that would contribute to potential impacts on agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, geological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise.** Tier A site connections to water and sewer systems would have the same significant effects as those identified in the PEIR as associated with development of Tier A sites. Development of Tier A sites would include potential impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, geological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise. The extension of pipe connections for sewer services would contribute to these impacts during Tier A site development. (FEIR Page 2.7-7 – 2.7-8)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-PS-1. Mitigation measures for the impacts of the extension of water and sewer connections onto Tier A sites are found in other sections of these Findings. For impacts on biological resources, cultural resources, paleontological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, transportation and circulation, and geological resources other than mineral resources, mitigation measures in the PEIR will result in less than significant impacts. For impacts on agricultural resources and mineral resources, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

Rationale: Mitigation measures in other sections of the PEIR and discussed in these Findings will reduce the Park's contribution to the impact of the extension of sewer and water service to Tier A sites. The mitigation measures will therefore reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. (FEIR Page 2.7-11)

9. Transportation and Circulation

Significant Effect: Impact TR-1: There is a potential for traffic from the Park to cause one or more road segments in the project area to exceed the criteria stated in the Guidelines for the Determination of Significance in the PEIR, potentially resulting in a significant impact. The Guidelines for the Determination of Significance find that a significant effect would occur if

additional or redistributed average daily trips (ADT) generated by the proposed project would significantly increase congestion on a Circulation Element Road or State Highway currently operating at level of service (LOS) E or LOS F, or would cause a Circulation Element Road or State Highway to operate at LOS E or LOS F as a result of the proposed project; or if the additional or redistributed ADT generated by the proposed project would cause a residential street to exceed its design capacity. (FEIR Page 2.8-4)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-TR-1. Prior to Director of Parks and Recreation approval of construction plans for Tier A sites in the Park, a Traffic Impact Report meeting County standards shall be prepared to assess potential impacts on appropriate street segments identified in the PEIR as determined by the County. The Traffic Impact Report shall identify impacts that violate County Guidelines for Significance and shall identify appropriate mitigation to be incorporated into the development project prior to construction plan approval. Acceptable mitigation measures may include:

- Turn restrictions
- Roadway widening to add lanes or shoulders
- Redesign of freeway on- and off-ramps
- Median construction/modification to restrict access
- Flaring of intersections to add turn lanes
- Provision of passing lanes or turnouts
- Acceleration and deceleration lanes
- Removal of obstructions
- Roundabouts
- Re-striping to add lanes with or without parking removal and restrictions
- Protected left-turn pockets, or free right-turn lanes
- Parking restrictions, daily or during peak hours
- Fair share contributions to approved projects identified in the County's Capital Improvement Plan
- Fair share contributions to traffic signals identified in the County's Traffic Signal Plan

Rationale: At the current time, since the locations of the Tier A sites that will generate traffic are not known, it is too speculative to determine the effects of project traffic on specific road segments. Mitigation measure M-TR-1 is designed to ensure that when sufficient information about the development of active uses in the Park is available, adequate study of the effects on the circulation system will be conducted and appropriate mitigation will be required. The requirement that these measures be implemented before the approval of construction plan will

ensure that potential impacts are mitigated to a level below significance. (FEIR Pages 2.8-13 - 2.8-14)

Significant Effect: Impact TR-2: There is a potential for traffic from the Park to cause one or more intersections in the project area to exceed the criteria stated in the Guidelines for the Determination of Significance in the PEIR, potentially resulting in a significant impact. A significant effect would occur, according to the Guidelines for the Determination of Significance, if additional or redistributed ADT generated by the proposed project would significantly increase congestion on a signalized intersection currently operating at LOS E or LOS F or would cause a signalized intersection to operate at LOS E or LOS F. A significant effect on an unsignalized intersection would occur if additional or redistributed ADT from the proposed project would (1) add 20 or more peak trips to a critical movement and cause the intersection to operate below LOS D; (2) add 20 or more peak trips to a critical movement at an intersection currently operating at LOS E; (3) add 5 or more peak trips to a critical movement and cause the intersection to operate at LOS F; (4) add 5 or more peak trips to a critical movement at an intersection currently operating at LOS F; or (5) significantly impact the operations of the intersection based on an evaluation of existing accident rates, the signal priority list, intersection geometrics, proximity of adjacent driveways, sight distance, or other factors. (FEIR Page 2.8-6)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-TR-2. Prior to Director of Parks and Recreation approval of construction plans for Tier A sites in the Park, a Traffic Impact Report meeting County standards shall be prepared to assess potential impacts on appropriate intersections listed below as determined by the County.

- State Route 76 (SR 76)/Interstate 15 (I-15) Northbound Ramps
- SR 76/I-15 Southbound Ramps
- SR 76 / Old Highway 395
- SR 76 / Gird Road
- SR 76 / South Mission Road
- SR 76 / Olive Hill Road / Camino Del Rey
- SR 76 / North River Road
- SR 76 / East Vista Way
- Camino Del Rey / Old River Road
- Camino Del Rey / West Lilac Road
- Old River Road / Little Gopher Canyon Road

The Traffic Impact Report shall identify impacts that violate County Guidelines for Significance, and shall identify appropriate mitigation to be incorporated into the development project prior to construction plan approval. Acceptable mitigation measures may include:

- New signal
- Signal modifications including timing, coordination, phasing improvements, or similar measures
- Turn restrictions
- Redesign of freeway on- and off-ramps
- Flaring of intersections to add turn lanes
- Re-striping to add lanes with or without parking removal and restrictions
- Protected left-turn pockets, or free right-turn lanes
- Parking restrictions, daily or during peak hours
- Fair share contributions to approved projects identified in the County's Capital Improvement Plan
- Fair share contributions to traffic signals identified in the County's Traffic Signal Plan

Rationale: At the current time, since the locations of the Tier A sites that will generate traffic are not known, it is too speculative to determine the effects of project traffic on specific intersections. Mitigation measure M-TR-2 is designed to ensure that when sufficient information about the development of active uses in the Park is available, adequate study of the effects on the circulation system will be conducted and appropriate mitigation will be required. The requirement that these measures be implemented before the approval of construction plans will ensure that potential impacts are mitigated to a level below significance. (FEIR Pages 2.8-13 - 2.8-14)

Significant Effect: Impact TR-3: There is a potential for traffic from the Park to cause traffic on SR 76 to exceed the criteria of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Congestion Management Program (CMP), potentially resulting in a significant impact. Projects that generate over 2,400 ADT or 200 peak-hour trips must comply with the traffic study requirements of SANDAG's CMP, using the current regional computer model. The total volume generated by full development of the Tier A sites (a total of approximately five sites with approximately 40 acres of active use areas) is estimated at 2,000 ADT, below the SANDAG criterion of 2,400 ADT. However, a total of 260 ADT might be generated in the AM peak hour, which would exceed the CMP peak-hour criterion. With approximately five Tier A sites planned at different locations, it is unlikely that 260 ADT would affect any particular road segment, but as a "worst-case" assumption, the proposed Park may need to comply with traffic study requirements of SANDAG's CMP. (FEIR Page 2.8-7)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-TR-3. Prior to Director of Parks and Recreation approval of construction plans for active use sites in the Park, a Traffic Impact Report meeting County standards shall be prepared to assess project conformance to SANDAG's CMP. If the proposed project would add 50 or more trips in either direction to SR 76, or 150 or more peak-hour trips in either direction to I-15, the traffic study shall comply with the requirements of the CMP using the current regional computer model. Any recommendations for mitigation shall be incorporated into the project before the approval of construction plans. Acceptable mitigation measures may include those listed in M-TR-1.

Rationale: At the current time, since the locations of the Tier A sites that will generate traffic are not known, it is too speculative to determine the effects of project traffic on SR 76. Mitigation measure M-TR-3 is designed to ensure that when sufficient information about the development of active uses in the Park is available, adequate study of the effects on the circulation system will be conducted and appropriate mitigation will be required. The requirement that these measures be implemented before the approval of construction plan will ensure that potential impacts are mitigated to a level below significance. (FEIR Pages 2.8-13 - 2.8-14)

Significant Effect: Impact TR-4: There is a potential for vehicles entering or leaving the Tier A sites to interfere with through traffic on the road providing access, potentially resulting in a significant impact. Design features or physical configurations of access roads to the Tier A sites could adversely affect the safe transport of vehicles along the roadway being accessed. (FEIR Page 2.8-7

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-TR-4. Prior to Director of Parks and Recreation approval of construction plans for active use sites in the Park, a Traffic Impact Report meeting County standards shall be prepared to assess planned access to the site, identify potential significant impacts, and recommend appropriate mitigation. The site access assessment should address turn lanes, queue lengths entering the site, adequacy of the sight distance, an assessment of the potential need for turn pocket/lanes and/or acceleration/deceleration lanes at the project driveways, and

any pedestrian/bicycle safety measures that need to be implemented. The study should provide recommendations to ensure adequate performance standards are met. Any recommendations for mitigation shall be incorporated into the project before the approval of construction plans. Acceptable mitigation measures may include those listed in M-TR-2.

Rationale: At the current time, since the locations of the Tier A sites that will generate traffic are not known, it is too speculative to determine the effects of project traffic on specific road segments. Mitigation measure M-TR-4 is designed to ensure that when sufficient information about the development of active uses in the Park is available, adequate study of the effects on transportation related hazards and safety is conducted and that appropriate mitigation will be required. The requirement that these measures be implemented before the approval of construction plan will ensure that potential impacts are mitigated to a level below significance. (FEIR Pages 2.8-13 - 2.8-14)

Significant Effect: Impact TR-5: There is a potential for the design of access to the Tier A sites not to conform to the County guidelines for pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle safety, potentially resulting in a significant impact. Vehicle entries to the Park would be located at the Tier A sites. A significant effect would occur if Park design does not take into account appropriate grading, location, sight lines, project features, and roadway geometry. (FEIR Page 2.8-8)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-TR-5. Prior to Director of Parks and Recreation approval of construction plans for active use sites in the Park, a Traffic Impact Report meeting County standards shall be prepared to assess the effect on pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle safety that might result from providing access to the site, identify potential significant impacts, and recommend appropriate mitigation. Any recommendations for mitigation shall meet County guidelines for pedestrian and bicycle safety and shall be incorporated into the project before the approval of construction plans.

Rationale: At the current time, since the locations of the Tier A sites that will generate traffic are not known, it is too speculative to determine the effects of project access traffic on specific road segments. Mitigation measure M-TR-5 is designed to ensure that when sufficient information about the development of active uses and access to the Park is available, adequate study of the effects on transportation related hazards and safety will be conducted and that appropriate mitigation will be required. The requirement that these measures be

implemented before the approval of construction plan will ensure that potential impacts are mitigated to a level below significance. (FEIR Pages 2.8-13 - 2.8-14)

Significant Effect: Impact TR-6: A significant effect would occur if parking facilities at the Park do not comply with the parking standards of the County Zoning Ordinance (Sections 6750-6799) and the County Off-Street Parking Design Manual, potentially resulting in a significant impact. Parking would be located at the Tier A sites. A significant impact would occur if Tier A sites with parking facilities do not provide adequate parking in conformance with the County Zoning Ordinance (Sections 6750-6799) and the County Off-Street Parking Design Manual. (FEIR Page 2.8-8)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-TR-6. Prior to Director of Parks and Recreation approval of construction plans for active use sites in the Park, a Traffic Impact Report meeting County standards shall be prepared to assess the adequacy of parking on the site and, identify potential significant impacts. Any recommended appropriate mitigation that complies with the parking standards of the County Zoning Ordinance (Sections 6750-6799) and the County Off- Street Parking Design Manual shall be incorporated into the project before the approval of the construction plans. If the proposed design does not meet these standards, the plans for the Tier A site shall be modified to provide adequate parking prior to the approval of construction plans.

Rationale: At the current time, since the locations of the Tier A sites that will generate traffic are not known, it is too speculative to determine the effects of project traffic on parking. Mitigation measure M-TR-6 is designed to ensure that when sufficient information about the development of active uses in the Park is available, adequate study assessing the adequacy of parking provided on site is conducted. The requirement that these measures be implemented before the approval of construction plan will ensure that potential impacts are mitigated to a level below significance. (FEIR Pages 2.8-13 - 2.8-14)

Significant Effect: Impact TR-7: A significant effect would occur if the design of the Park does not locate at least one Tier A site in proximity to Bus Route 306, and if the Park does not include bicycle storage facilities at Tier A sites where practical. Location of active uses near a bus route and the provision of bicycle storage facilities are meant to increase opportunities for alternative transportation modes. (FEIR Page 2.8-9)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-TR-7a. The Director of Parks and Recreation shall ensure that as plans for Tier A sites are developed, at least one Tier A site shall be located in proximity to Bus Route 306.

M-TR-7b. The Director of Parks and Recreation shall ensure that as plans for Tier A sites are developed, each Tier A site provides bicycle storage facilities.

Rationale: Mitigation measures M-TR-7a and M-TR-7b will ensure that alternative transportation is available to the Park by ensuring that at least one Tier A site is located in proximity to Bus Route 306 and that each Tier A site provides bicycle storage facilities. (FEIR Pages 2.8-13 - 2.8-14)

Significant Effect: Impact TR-8: A significant effect would occur if traffic from the proposed project, in combination with traffic from other projects in the cumulative projects area, would cause adverse levels of service at road segments or intersections in the project vicinity. A significant cumulative impact would result if the project together with cumulative projects would cause a roadway segment to fall below LOS D operating conditions, add a significant amount of traffic to a roadway segment expected to operate at LOS E or F under existing or future conditions, cause an intersection to fall below LOS D operating conditions and/or add a substantial amount of traffic to an existing intersection operating at LOS E or F or an intersection expected to operate at LOS E or F in the future. For signalized intersections, a delay of 2 seconds at LOS E would be significant and a delay of 1 second at LOS F would be significant. For unsignalized intersection the allowable increase in traffic would be 12 trips on a critical movement at LOS E and 5 trips on a critical movement at LOS F. (FEIR Page 2.8-3 – 2.8-5 and 2.8-10)

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA §21081(a)(1), specific changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid, mitigate, or substantially lessen this potential effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures:

M-TR-8. Prior to Director of Parks and Recreation approval of construction plans for active use sites in the Park, a Traffic Impact Report meeting County standards shall be prepared to analyze the cumulative impacts based on Year 2015 and Year 2030 SANDAG traffic models according to County guidelines. The assessment for 2015 shall assess impacts with SR 76 as both a two-lane and a four-lane facility. Prior to Director of Parks and Recreation approval of

construction plans for any Tier A site, the Parks and Recreation Department shall pay the County Transportation Impact Fee (TIF), if applicable, for that site for any significant cumulative impacts identified in the Traffic Impact Report. Additional mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project for those areas that are not covered under the County's TIF program.

Rationale: The County's TIF is a program to fund projected future road improvements in the unincorporated County, and is designed to pay for potential cumulative impacts from development projects. Implementation of M-TR-8 would mitigate cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.